

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Notice mailed February 12, 2008 that the RCE filed November 29, 2007 presented claims different from any invention originally claimed, Applicant submits replacement claims. In order to avoid still further confusion, these claims are numbered claims 34-42. Claims 1 through 33 have been pending in this patent application including the allegedly improper RCE.

The newly submitted claims generally correspond to claims 1-9 that were presented in response to the first Office Action in the Response that was filed April 24, 2007. However, claim 34, the sole independent claim now submitted, differs from the claim 1 previously presented in the final six paragraphs of claim 34. Those six paragraphs describe further the card identification information as being provided by a combination of resonant tags, define the location of the first identification information detector, and further describe the first identification information detectors. Those detectors include a card frequency register, a receiver that detects echo waves from the resonant tags, and a collator that compares the frequencies detected with the frequencies registered in order to identify a particular playing card. This description is supported in the patent application as filed in originally numbered paragraph [0023] through paragraph [0031], from page 10, line 9 through page 12, line 26 of the specification. That discussion particularly pertains to Figure 2B of the patent application.


In the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4 because of an alleged ambiguity with respect to the use of the term "cards." Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's view since each of the ID cards mentioned in the claims is so identified and the other cards, which are playing cards, are differently identified. However, to avoid a repetition of this non-substantive issue, the claims presented here also differ from the claims previously presented by addition the word "playing" when "playing cards" are referred to.

The claims appearing in the patent application at the time the Office Action of July 13, 2007 was issued were rejected as unpatentable over Soltys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,460,848, hereinafter Soltys) in view of Meissner et al. (U.S. Patent 5,779,545, hereinafter Meissner). This rejection is respectfully traversed as to the claims presented here.

While a lengthy discussion might be provided regarding Soltys and Meissner, it is sufficient to point out that neither of those patents describes a game management system in which the card identification information of each of the playing cards is provided through combinations of resonant tags attached to the cards, in which identification information detectors are located proximate a dealer and a participant in the game, and in which each of those identification information detectors includes a card frequency register, a receiver that detects echo waves from the resonant tags of the playing cards, and an analysis unit that correlates the frequencies of those echo waves detected with the frequencies registered in the card register. Accordingly, no modification of Soltys with Meissner could not produce the claimed invention nor establish *prima facie* obviousness as to any claim now pending.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: March 7, 2008
JAW:ves